

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 1017 of 2014

Bhagirathi Prasad Bisai S/o Late Shri Parmanand Bisai Aged About 72 Years R/o Ward No. 24 Nayapara Thana Mahasamund Civil & Revenue Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Nagriya Prashashan, Mahanadi Bhawan Captial Complex, Raipur Distt. Raipur C.G.
2. The Collector Mahasamund, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.
3. Municipal Council Mahasamund Through Its Chief Municipal Officer, Municipal Council Mahasamund, Distt. Mahasamund C.G.
4. C.G. State Electricity Distribution Company Limited Through Executive Engineer Mahasamund Distt. Mahasamund C.G.
5. Junior Engineer, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Distribution Company Limited Town Mahasamund, Distt. Mahasamund C..G
6. Councilor (Parshad) Ward No. 24 Nayapara Municipal Council Mahasamund Distt. Mahasamund C.G.

---- Respondents

Shri Sunil Sahu, counsel for the petitioner/s.

Shri Manish Nigam, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents 1 and 2.

Shri Sudeep Agrawal, counsel for respondents 3 and 6.

Shri K.R.Nair, counsel for respondents 4 and 5.

Order On Board

17/08/2015

The petitioner has filed this petition raising manifold grievances against different respondents. According to the petitioner, on his land, a transformer has been installed by the respondent / Electricity company but for that, compensation has not been paid.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent / Electricity company submitted that the petitioner may approach the Collector who shall decide the amount of compensation and whatever amount is determined as compensation payable to the petitioner, will be paid by the Electricity Company.

3. As far as grievance of the petitioner against Municipal Council is concerned, it is entirely different from the grievance raised by the petitioner with regard to the aspect of compensation due to use of his land by the Electricity company. Different cause of action against the respondents cannot be clubbed together in one petition. Therefore, in respect of other grievances, the petitioner would be at liberty to file separate petition.

4. With the aforesaid observations, the petition is finally disposed off.

Sd/-

Manindra Mohan Shrivastava
Judge